

REMARKS

In the last response, two points were made. First, it was argued that claim 1 calls for identifying whether a portion of a file system received by a client is stored in a first location associated with portions of the file system that have previously been stored by the client or rather, instead, the portion is stored in a second location associated with portions of a file system that were streamed to the client by a server.

It was argued there that, at a minimum then, the cited reference must teach a system that stores portions of a file system streamed to the client in one location and portions that have been previously stored in another location. Secondly, the reference must teach identifying which of these two situations apply to a given stored portion.

It was argued then that neither the first or the second item described above is set forth in the cited reference.

In the final rejection, material from column 7, lines 32-45 is cited. It is respectfully submitted that this does not meet either of the two missing elements. Nor does it explain which of the two elements it addresses or how it addresses both of the missing elements. Since this material was never cited before, it is difficult to understand how it meets these elements.

The first sentence is that the client file retriever passes the name of the file to a main file retriever/provider which receives the portion of the file in the main frame file storage using the operating system 26. It is not seen how this could meet either of the elements. It does not indicate whether a portion of the file system is stored in a location that has been previously stored by the client or, rather, it is stored in the second location associated with streaming. It does not even have anything to do with the file system. It seems to only talk about a single file.

Then, the quoted material goes on to talk about the receiver/provider returning the portion of the file via the reverse path. Again, there is no identifying whether a portion of a file system has anything done to it. Even if we equate file and file system, which is illogical, there is no indication whether the file has been stored in a location associated with portions of the file that have been previously stored on the client or, instead, stored in a file system that was streamed. The reason this is is the cited material has nothing to do with the distinction between previously stored and streamed data. In fact, it has nothing to do with streamed data whatsoever.


The next sentence quoted talks about a portion of the file may be less than all the file. Note that, again, we are talking about a file, not a file system, and we still are not talking about stored files versus streamed files and having different locations for them.

The next sentence talks about the provider providing the portion of the file or a handle to the portion of the file stored in memory or disk to a mapper. It is not seen how this is relevant.

The last sentence talks about a UNC mapper that provides the portion of the file or a handle that receives to the operating system. Again, we have no discussion of identification of whether a file system is received by the client and stored in two different locations depending on whether it was stored previously or streamed to the client. Therefore, reconsideration would still be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 22, 2007



\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057-2631  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation